

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated June 14, 2006 in which the Examiner rejected claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. §101 and rejected claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Attached to this Amendment is an Information Disclosure Statement.

As indicated above, claims 1, 22 and 31 have been amended for stylistic reasons. The amendments are unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability and do not narrow the literal scope of the claims.

Claim 31 has been amended to be directed to the statutory subject matter. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Claim 1 claims a method for generating and finishing documents, claim 22 claims a system for generating and finishing documents and claim 31 claims a computer program structure. The method, system and computer program structure include a) converting a first data file in a first format into a second data file in a second format and b) processing the second data file into a processed second data file where image defining instructions are processed into driving instructions for generating a document and other instructions for finishing the document are processed into driving instructions for finishing the document.

Through the method, system and program a) converting a first data file in a first format into a second data file in a second format and b) processing the second data file into a processed second data file where image defining instructions are processed into driving instructions for generating a document and other instructions for finishing the document are processed into driving instructions for finishing the

document as claimed in claims 1, 22 and 31, the claimed invention provides a method, system and program which limits the required variety of driver software needed to control the generation and finishing of documents in order to maintain manageability of document images obtained using known driver software. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1, 22 and 31.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 12-13, 19-23, 26-28 and 30-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Krist et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,615,015) in view of *Hadewe* (EP 0 628 357).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be set forth below, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

Krist et al. appears to disclose to a method of performing an image processing operation on the network job at a printing machine, the printing machine being disposed remotely of an input source at which the network job was developed. (column 1, lines 11-15). Referring to step 208, a determination is made as to whether a transformation (e.g. a reduction operation) is requested. For those pages in which a remote image processing request is not input (step 210), the emitter will simply convert the corresponding image data and page format properties into a page description language ("PDL") description. As mentioned above, the PDL can assume various commercially available forms. For those pages in which a remote image processing is input (step 212), the instruction, corresponding to the image processing, is converted into PDL description for use by the printing system 2. (Column 10, line 64 to column 11, line 8). At step 214, a check is performed to

determine if all of the input document has been converted to a PDL description. As soon as the conversion process for the input document is complete, the converted input document is transmitted to the printing system 2 for eventual processing thereof. Preferably, the job is interpreted at the printing system so that the PDL description is submitted to preparsing and coalescing processes. During the preparsing process, the printing/finishing instruction(s) are separated from the image data and the fonts are bound with the document or job. It will be appreciated that outline fonts are preferably used to implement the disclosed embodiment when such embodiment is used for reduction or enlargement. Along with preparsing and coalescing, the job is postparsed so that it is placed into an appropriate format for consumption by a marker. (Column 11, lines 17-31).

Thus, *Krist et al.* merely discloses converting image data and page format properties into a page description language. (Column 11, lines 1-3). Nothing in *Krist et al.* shows, teaches or suggests processing a second data file in a second format into a processed second data file where image defining instructions are processed into driving instructions and other instructions for finishing the document are processed into driving instructions as claimed in claims 1, 22 and 31. Rather, *Krist et al.* only discloses converting a corresponding image data and page format properties into a page description language.

Hadewe appears to disclose a method for processing sheets in a mail processing apparatus comprising a plurality of processing stations, such as for instance a printer and an inserter, and a control system controlling at least one processing station for printing sheets and/or assembling sheets to form at least one document to be mailed. (Column 1, lines 1-7). The digital document is provided, by

means of the text unit, with a code comprising a non-print code, which cannot be printed by the printer. The advantage of this is that the digital code can be placed in a digital text without it being possible to subsequently read this code in the printed document. Here, too, a major advantage is gained in that such codes are often already available on standard word processing software. Thus, the non-print code may for instance comprise an escape sequence. It is also possible, however, to include, for instance, a code beginning and ending with, respectively, a shift-in and a shift-out code from the well known ASCII table. In that case the control unit is adapted to recognize such codes and drive the processing stations accordingly. (Column 3, lines 17-33). A mail processing system is characterized in that the system further comprises a separate text unit, not belonging to the mail processing apparatus, with which at least one digital document can be generated in digital form, in which at least one digital code also generated with the text unit is included, this digital code comprising information about the manner in which the control system is to control the processing stations for printing and assembling sheets, and the control system, when the digital document is being supplied to it in digital form, records the digital document in digital form, recognizes the code and, depending on the code, controls at least one processing station. (Column 6, line 46 to column 7, line 2).

Thus, *Hadewe* merely discloses generating at least one digital code with a text unit, the digital code comprising information about the manner in which the control system is to be controlled (column 6, line 46 through column 7, line 2). Nothing *Hadewe* shows, teaches or suggests processing a second data file in a second format into a processed second data file where image defining instructions are processing into driving instructions and other instructions for finishing the

document are processed into driving instructions for finishing the document as claimed in claims 1, 22 and 31. Rather, *Hadewe* only discloses adding a non-print code to a document by means of a text unit.

The combination of *Krist et al.* and *Hadewe* would merely suggest that after the data file is processed as taught by *Krist et al.*, adding a digital code thereto as taught by *Hadewe*. Thus, nothing in the combination of the references shows, teaches or suggests processing a second data file in a second data format (which is obtained by converting a first data file in a first data format) where image defining instructions are processed into driving instructions for generating a document and other instructions for finishing the document are processed into driving instructions for finishing the document as claimed in claims 1, 22 and 31. Rather, the combination merely discloses adding a code to an input document.

Since nothing in the combination of *Krist et al.* and *Hadewe* show, teach or suggest the primary features as claimed in claims 1, 22 and 31, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1, 22 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 2-5, 7, 9, 12-13, 19-21, 23, 26-28 and 30 depend from claims 1, 22 and 31 and recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-5, 7, 9, 12-13, 19-21, 23, 26-28 and 30 would not have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §103 over *Krist et al.* and *Hadewe* at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2-5, 7, 9, 12-13, 19-21, 23, 26-28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Claims 6 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Krist et al.* and *Hadewe* and further in view of *Salgado* (U.S. Patent 5,777,882). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Krist et al.* and *Hadewe* and further in view of *Girard* (U.S. Patent 6,393,135). Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Krist et al.* and *Hadewe* and further in view of *Gombault et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,283,752). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Krist et al.* and *Hadewe* and further in view of *Taylor* (U.S. Patent 5,245,545). Claims 15-18 and 24-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Krist et al.* and *Hadewe* and further in view of *Maritzen et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,899,990).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103. The claims have been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and for reasons which will be set forth below, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to the claims and allows the claims to issue.

As discussed above, since nothing in the combination of the primary references shows, teaches or suggests the primary features as claimed in claims 1 and 22, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the primary references with the secondary references will not overcome the deficiencies of the primary references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 6, 8, 10-11, 14-18, 24-25 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Thus it now appears that the application is now in condition for reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early are respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: October 13, 2006

By:



Ellen Marcie Emas
Registration No. 32131

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620